

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the application in light of the amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully note that an Information Disclosure Statement, accompanied by PTO Form 1449, was filed concurrently with the application on October 25, 2001. Applicants request that the Examiner review the cited references, and initial Form 1449 so that the references are made of record and identified on the face of any patent which may issue from this application.

**Status of the Claims**

Claims 1-16 are pending. Claims 5 and 13 have been amended to be in independent form, and now recite the features of their respective base and intervening claims. No new matter is added.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants appreciatively acknowledge the Examiner's allowance of claims 3, 4, 11 and 12, and the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 5 and 13.



duration. Izumi does not disclose correcting the input display signal. Therefore, Applicants submit that Izumi does not disclose each and every feature of independent claims 1 and 9. Thus, Izumi does not anticipate the invention of claims 1 and 9.

Claims 7 and 8 depend from claim 1. Claims 15 and 16 depend from claim 9. Applicants submit that claims 7, 8, 15 and 16 are patentable over Izumi for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal and reconsideration of the rejection.

### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 2, 6, 10 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Izumi in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,611,249 to Evanicky et al. ("Evanicky"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner acknowledges that Izumi does not disclose that a parameter includes information used for tone reproduction curve correction or a white balance adjustment. The Examiner cites Evanicky as disclosing "a tone reproduction curve correction and a white balance adjustment upon receiving a light-sensing signal from a light sending device." (Detailed Office Action, item 5, page 4.) The Examiner contends that it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Izumi and Evanicky to achieve the claimed invention.

Applicants submit that the combination of Izumi and Evanicky neither discloses nor suggests, singly or in combination, the feature recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claim 9, of “a parameter adjusting means for, with a variation in a light state of said lighting means as a trigger, adjusting a parameter participating in picture quality so as to conform said light state.” Claims 2 and 6 depend from claim 1. Claims 10 and 14 depend from claim 9. Applicants submit that the combination of Izumi and Evanicky does not result in the invention of claims 2, 6, 10 and 14, and that claims 2, 6, 10 and 14 are patentable over the combination of Izumi and Evanicky for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims. Thus, Applicants submit that the Examiner has not met the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Withdrawal and reconsideration of the rejection is requested.

